

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 - 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arnstein et al. (US 5,889,821, hereinafter “Arnstein”) in view of Hall (US 3,543,156). Claim 1 is amended for clarification but such amendment is not believed necessary to overcome the grounds of rejection.

More specifically, the official action rejected claim 1 because Arnstein purportedly teaches a radio front end, a baseband processor, producing a corresponding control signal to the baseband processor to inhibit wireless transmissions from the radio front end while the radar pulse pattern is being detected. In support therefor, the official action cites col. 6, lines 54-61 of Arnstein noting that no transmissions are made at all. Additionally, the actions states that Arnstein teaches that the baseband processor does not produce outgoing digital signals based on the control signal. The action cites col. 9, lines 1-6 and col. 6, lines 54-61 and notes that no outgoing signals are made at all.

The Applicant does not believe that the cited art teaches what is being claimed because the claim elements of claim 1 require a different response than is taught by Arnstein when radar pulses are detected. Namely, the cited art does not teach inhibiting transmissions while a radar signal is being detected.

More specifically, claim 1 requires:

*radar detection circuit .... produces a **corresponding control signal** indicating whether a radar signal has been detected to the baseband processor to inhibit wireless transmissions from the radio front end while the radar pulse pattern is being detected; and*

*wherein the baseband processor **does not produce outgoing digital signals based on the control signal while the radar pulse pattern is being detected.***

Arnstein, in col. 6, lines 54-61, states that a “receive terminal”, during “the radar’s ON time” that “the received RF signal is blanked out.” Thereafter, a modified error correction scheme is used to compensate for the blanked out portion of the received signal to make the

radar interference transparent so that “service is restored to the level of quality provided by conventional systems as if there were no radar present.” (Col. 7, lines 1-3). The official action further cites Arnstein, in col. 9, lines 1-6 in support of the rejection. In col. 9, lines 1-3, however, Arnstein describes the receive signal reconstruction that is modified to improve operation based radar interference.

From these discussions, it is very clear that Arnstein is directed and limited to teachings that relate to improving signal reception in a receiver when a radar signal is present. The required elements of the claim have nothing to do with receive operations or error compensation for radar interference. Rather, the claims are directed to transmit operations to avoid transmitting outgoing signals while a radar signal is present to avoid interfering with the radar. Thus, the claims are directed to solving a problem that is opposite of the problem that Arnstein is attempting to solve.

More specifically, Arnstein does not teach generating a control signal to inhibit the baseband processor from generating outgoing data while a radar signal is present. Arnstein does not address transmitter operation in relation to the radar signal and is only concerned with receiver operations. Arnstein is thus silent about whether transmissions occur in the presence of radar. Arnstein certainly does not teach inhibiting transmissions when a radar signal is detected.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance; therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-16 as set forth in paragraph 6 of the Office Action, and full allowance of same.

Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Respectfully submitted,

GARLICK HARRISON & MARKISON

Dated: June 3 , 2008

/James A. Harrison/Reg. No. 40,401

James A. Harrison

Garlick Harrison & Markison  
P. O. Box 160727  
Austin, TX 78716-0727  
Voice: (214) 902-8100  
Fax: (214) 902-8101